

RESOURCES AND REFORM FOR MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOLS:

THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001



January 2002

Prepared by Staff of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation
and Staff of the United States Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, Chairman

FOREWORD



Throughout our history, education has opened the doors of opportunity for generations of Americans. It has been a long and continuing battle, and it goes on today.

It is my belief and hope that in conjunction with adequate, ongoing investment, the No Child Left Behind Act will help fulfill the promise of a better education and greater opportunity for every child in America.

Too many of the nation's public schools have fallen short of this great and noble goal in recent years. Many of them are also facing challenges that they have never encountered before. Ninety percent of all American children attend public schools. Enrollment in those schools is at an all-time high of 53 million children. 10.3 million students are from poor families. The student population is more diverse than ever. 4.1 million children have limited proficiency in English – an increase of 104 percent in the last 10 years. Approximately, 2 million more teachers will need to be hired in the next 10 years in order to keep pace with rising enrollments. We must do all we can to help schools and communities meet these challenges, so that every child will have the opportunity to enjoy a good, quality public education.

A major goal of the No Child Left Behind Act is to reduce over a 12-year period the educational achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers, and between minority and non-minority students. Wide gaps between these students have been tolerated for far too long.

Under the new law, student achievement results will be reported by race, disability, limited English proficiency, and poverty, so that States, school districts, and schools will be held accountable for *all* children.

We know that school improvement has significant costs. The No Child Left Behind Act contains a substantial down payment on the cost of school reform. Massachusetts will receive almost \$900 million in federal school aid next year – a \$114 million increase over this current school year.

Federal education funds, to a degree never before seen, will be targeted on the children who need help the most, but too often get the least help from public education.

The new law helps ensure that a qualified teacher is present in every classroom, and

expands opportunities for professional development to strengthen the skills of new and older teachers alike.

It provides resources to help states continue to reduce class size, particularly in the early grades.

It expands after-school activities, to provide more students with extra opportunities to improve their learning.

It strengthens programs to see that children learn in schools that are safe and drug-free.

It increases accountability and resources for students with limited proficiency in English.

It expands support for early reading, to see that all children read well by the end of the third grade.

It funds new national priorities to help communities address pressing needs through programs such as drop out prevention, advanced placement, school library enhancement, economics education, mental health services for children, and recruitment of teachers and principals.

It provides greater parent involvement, and greater public school choice options for parents.

The new law includes all of these reforms, and it rejects the failed experiments of private school vouchers and block grants to states.

Taken together, the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act lays a solid foundation for major improvements in every public school in America. Our enduring challenge is to do all we can in the years ahead to achieve its full potential for all of America's children. Massachusetts, the nation, and our nation's children deserve no less.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword by Senator Edward M. Kennedy	ii
Highlights	v
District-By-District Summary	vii
Massachusetts Impact	ix
Challenging Needs	xiv
National Summary of Policy Changes	xvi

HIGHLIGHTS

Massachusetts Resources

- ◆ Increases Massachusetts K-12 federal education funding by \$114 million.
 - ⇒ 51,300 more disadvantaged children to receive supplemental education services, including one-on-one tutoring and specialized reading instruction.
 - ⇒ 13,400 more children to receive after-school learning opportunities.
 - ⇒ 7,000 more teachers able to receive high quality professional development training.
 - ⇒ 4,200 more bilingual and immigrant children to receive support to learn English and achieve academically.
- ◆ Increases school aid to every Massachusetts school district. The poorest districts will receive a more than 30% increase in federal school aid next school year. An even greater share of future funding increases is directed to high poverty school districts.
- ◆ The largest funding increases go to:
 - ⇒ Boston, which will receive over \$15 million in increased federal school aid next year.
 - ⇒ Springfield, which will receive nearly \$6 million in increased federal school aid next year.
 - ⇒ Worcester, which will receive over \$4 million in increased school aid next year.
- ◆ Increases bilingual education aid to Massachusetts by 42%. Nineteen school districts with large numbers of limited English proficient students will get federal bilingual aid for the first time ever next year.

Massachusetts Reform

- ◆ By the 2005-2006 school year, Massachusetts will develop five additional MCAS tests to assess all students in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8. Massachusetts will receive more than \$24 million over the next three years to develop the newly required MCAS tests.
- ◆ The parents of an estimated 104,000 students in 259 schools will be offered the option to choose a different public school and receive supplemental tutoring services before school, after-school, or during the summer.

- ◆ All Massachusetts parents will receive report cards that provide information on student achievement throughout the State, including graduation rates for middle and high-school students, and the professional qualifications of teachers. For the first time, parents will also receive a separate report card for their local school district and neighborhood school that shows how their local district and school ranks compared to others in the State.

DISTRICT-BY-DISTRICT SUMMARY

Staff of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation have prepared district-by-district estimates of the 2002-2003 school year financial impact of the No Child Left Behind Act based on data supplied by the Congressional Research Service, past allocation practices of the Massachusetts Department of Education, and preliminary data made available by the United States Department of Education.

School districts should not rely on the attached estimates when making budgeting decisions for the 2002-2003 school year. Estimates were prepared using a series of assumptions based on Massachusetts and United States Department of Education past practice. Practices and underlying data used to make allocation estimates are subject to change.

Estimates are only provided for school districts for which the Massachusetts Department of Education provided both Eisenhower and Class Size Reduction program allocations and for which the United States Department of Education has United States Bureau of Census generated population and poverty data. Primarily, the attached estimates therefore exclude charter school, regional school, and vocational school districts.

In making the attached estimate, 5% of all federal formula grant funds are withheld for distribution to charter school, regional school, and vocational school districts. A 5% set-aside is assumed because for the 2001-2002 school year, approximately 5% of statewide Individual Disabilities with Education Act (IDEA) funds were distributed to charter school, regional school, and vocational school districts. IDEA is the largest and only federal education program for which complete state distribution data was available at the time of publication.

The attached estimates also assume that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will set aside for administration costs: the maximum amount of 1% of statewide funds under the Title I program; the maximum of 5% of statewide funds under the Title II Teacher Quality Grant program; and the maximum 5% of statewide funds under the Title III Bilingual Education program. Estimates also assume that 16% out of a maximum of 20% of statewide IDEA funds will be set aside for administration and state-level activities as was done by the Massachusetts Department of Education during the 2001-2002 school year.

Estimates for bilingual and immigrant education only consider funds earmarked for instructional and support services for limited English proficient (LEP) and immigrant children under Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act. Funding comparisons included

throughout this report reflect federal fiscal year 2001 appropriations under Subpart 1 of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) and the Emergency Immigrant Education Program (EIEP) of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. Federal fiscal year 2002 estimates for Title III allocations include continuation awards for school districts holding current bilingual education competitive grants awarded by the United States Department of Education

Title III estimates by school district reflect funds for federal fiscal year 2001 distributed by competitive grant under the BEA and funds distributed by formula under the EIEP. Estimates do not, however, reflect the approximately \$1.4 million in EIEP funds distributed by the State of Massachusetts to school districts during the 2001-2002 school year under a State competitive grant program. The attached estimates assume Massachusetts will dedicate 15% of the total State Title III allocation – 1.2 million in funds in the 2002-2003 school year – to be distributed by competitive grant.

Finally, readers should note that the included staff analysis linked to district poverty estimates is based on data supplied United States Bureau of Census, which utilizes a poverty index equal to \$17,100 a year for a family of four.

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Abington	\$567,713	\$96,193	20%
Acton	\$527,783	\$92,576	21%
Acton-Boxborough	\$390,724	\$53,398	16%
Acushnet	\$345,887	\$49,123	17%
Adams-Cheshire	\$794,896	\$122,705	18%
Agawam	\$1,346,195	\$180,064	15%
Amesbury	\$804,173	\$123,898	18%
Amherst	\$881,420	\$141,721	19%
Amherst-Pelham	\$584,473	\$65,482	13%
Andover	\$1,117,909	\$213,426	24%
Arlington	\$1,451,960	\$255,846	21%
Ashburnham-Westminster	\$677,191	\$119,724	21%
Ashland	\$451,107	\$45,993	11%
Athol-Royalston	\$1,210,783	\$208,766	21%
Attleboro	\$2,199,539	\$419,588	24%
Auburn	\$430,538	\$66,894	18%
Ayer	\$468,303	\$71,922	18%
Barnstable	\$2,274,719	\$204,805	10%
Bedford	\$343,725	\$49,029	17%
Belchertown	\$565,789	\$90,868	19%
Bellingham	\$744,596	\$108,373	17%
Belmont	\$775,810	\$130,296	20%
Berkley	\$255,004	\$37,668	17%
Berlin	\$52,795	\$8,041	18%
Berlin-Boylston	\$78,794	\$10,832	16%
Beverly	\$1,683,852	\$290,146	21%
Billerica	\$1,165,852	\$131,226	13%
Blackstone-Millville	\$592,134	\$100,259	20%
Boston	\$63,575,299	\$15,413,693	32%
Bourne	\$858,860	\$134,609	19%
Boxborough	\$82,932	\$14,074	20%
Boylston	\$74,692	\$9,239	14%
Braintree	\$1,338,298	\$219,327	20%
Bridgewater-Raynham	\$1,277,175	\$204,788	19%
Brockton	\$11,555,508	\$2,213,596	24%
Brookline	\$2,211,891	\$401,129	22%
Burlington	\$791,334	\$126,267	19%
Cambridge	\$4,805,573	\$713,580	17%
Canton	\$515,751	\$75,428	17%
Carlisle	\$110,787	\$18,033	19%

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Carver	\$711,062	\$105,955	18%
Central Berkshire	\$791,618	\$121,181	18%
Chatham	\$223,178	\$40,813	22%
Chelsea	\$5,012,755	\$1,286,081	35%
Chicopee	\$3,866,413	\$674,726	21%
Clarksburg	\$74,455	\$10,557	17%
Clinton	\$744,002	\$109,850	17%
Cohasset	\$241,940	\$33,795	16%
Concord-Carlisle	\$225,204	\$38,204	20%
Danvers	\$1,008,353	\$179,085	22%
Dartmouth	\$1,166,762	\$220,983	23%
Dedham	\$886,633	\$147,960	20%
Dennis-Yarmouth	\$2,415,607	\$458,623	23%
Dighton-Rehoboth	\$508,152	\$76,384	18%
Dover	\$124,461	\$20,099	19%
Dover-Sherborn	\$165,068	\$24,835	18%
Dracut	\$996,983	\$126,196	14%
Duxbury	\$600,105	\$86,613	17%
East Bridgewater	\$571,445	\$98,719	21%
East Longmeadow	\$705,464	\$87,124	14%
Easthampton	\$649,290	\$51,957	9%
Easton	\$926,401	\$146,874	19%
Everett	\$2,796,720	\$213,550	8%
Fairhaven	\$657,579	\$96,557	17%
Fall River	\$9,469,789	\$2,048,493	28%
Falmouth	\$2,000,081	\$346,119	21%
Farmington River Reg	\$132,104	\$19,503	17%
Fitchburg	\$4,248,856	\$778,242	22%
Foxborough	\$749,284	\$115,472	18%
Framingham	\$3,001,318	\$487,429	19%
Franklin	\$895,312	\$102,445	13%
Freetown-Lakeville	\$361,048	\$49,582	16%
Frontier	\$217,359	\$29,206	16%
Gardner	\$1,614,028	\$276,507	21%
Gateway	\$528,513	\$70,952	16%
Georgetown	\$335,070	\$59,284	21%
Gill-Montague	\$795,024	\$118,840	18%
Gloucester	\$1,310,940	\$207,016	19%
Grafton	\$483,400	\$82,303	21%
Granby	\$252,783	\$39,763	19%
Granville	\$73,164	\$11,214	18%

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Greenfield	\$1,572,288	\$205,672	15%
Hadley	\$124,852	\$21,073	20%
Hamilton-Wenham	\$444,193	\$80,284	22%
Hampden-Wilbraham	\$810,293	\$107,233	15%
Hampshire	\$158,359	\$19,477	14%
Hanover	\$473,913	\$70,200	17%
Harvard	\$308,081	\$59,922	24%
Harwich	\$439,129	\$69,775	19%
Hatfield	\$89,943	\$12,491	16%
Haverhill	\$3,873,383	\$649,271	20%
Hingham	\$648,743	\$108,225	20%
Holbrook	\$560,640	\$69,832	14%
Holliston	\$562,636	\$69,878	14%
Holyoke	\$8,740,544	\$2,386,726	38%
Hopedale	\$188,521	\$25,445	16%
Hopkinton	\$518,713	\$84,961	20%
Hudson	\$735,737	\$128,716	21%
Hull	\$643,193	\$98,796	18%
Ipswich	\$430,677	\$70,041	19%
King Philip	\$319,480	\$46,256	17%
Kingston	\$309,497	\$53,378	21%
Lawrence	\$14,707,650	\$4,111,206	39%
Lee	\$296,456	\$28,263	11%
Lenox	\$225,316	\$35,204	19%
Leominster	\$2,331,766	\$381,205	20%
Lexington	\$1,341,946	\$199,024	17%
Lincoln-Sudbury	\$181,526	\$28,701	19%
Littleton	\$272,165	\$41,785	18%
Longmeadow	\$613,375	\$85,887	16%
Lowell	\$14,157,123	\$2,943,216	26%
Ludlow	\$734,020	\$102,503	16%
Lunenburg	\$426,931	\$78,846	23%
Lynn	\$10,783,896	\$1,227,292	13%
Lynnfield	\$373,517	\$60,842	19%
Malden	\$3,076,741	\$195,751	7%
Mansfield	\$743,837	\$122,675	20%
Marblehead	\$560,495	\$82,992	17%
Marion	\$102,296	\$17,100	20%
Marlborough	\$1,436,085	\$137,072	11%
Marshfield	\$839,895	\$87,617	12%
Marthas Vineyard	\$188,724	\$23,424	14%

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Mashpee	\$585,272	\$40,609	7%
Mattapoissett	\$114,020	\$15,458	16%
Maynard	\$438,147	\$74,232	20%
Medfield	\$363,814	\$63,433	21%
Medford	\$2,036,901	\$359,444	21%
Medway	\$544,704	\$83,456	18%
Melrose	\$888,142	\$142,631	19%
Mendon-Upton	\$354,064	\$55,712	19%
Methuen	\$2,815,917	\$363,097	15%
Middleborough	\$1,057,093	\$168,515	19%
Milford	\$1,287,513	\$219,392	21%
Millbury	\$431,250	\$36,821	9%
Millis	\$297,986	\$44,554	18%
Milton	\$970,273	\$125,948	15%
Mohawk Trail	\$712,930	\$105,255	17%
Monson	\$339,466	\$31,499	10%
Mount Greylock	\$165,155	\$29,037	21%
Nahant	\$79,137	\$3,737	5%
Narragansett	\$409,777	\$61,914	18%
Nashoba	\$708,443	\$112,050	19%
Natick	\$899,298	\$123,298	16%
Nauset	\$415,582	\$71,477	21%
Needham	\$1,004,830	\$184,133	22%
New Bedford	\$12,581,195	\$2,805,386	29%
New Salem-Wendell	\$89,293	\$5,516	7%
Newburyport	\$679,550	\$119,926	21%
Newton	\$2,569,867	\$430,369	20%
Norfolk	\$181,910	\$28,219	18%
North Adams	\$1,328,847	\$228,374	21%
North Andover	\$759,959	\$99,583	15%
North Attleborough	\$895,440	\$98,355	12%
North Brookfield	\$239,948	\$41,643	21%
North Middlesex	\$977,410	\$161,057	20%
North Reading	\$405,798	\$61,070	18%
Northampton	\$1,572,578	\$265,924	20%
Northboro-Southboro	\$180,220	\$30,474	20%
Norton	\$733,661	\$115,244	19%
Norwell	\$311,811	\$49,755	19%
Norwood	\$954,599	\$115,136	14%
Old Rochester	\$241,920	\$30,313	14%
Orange	\$576,976	\$94,504	20%

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Palmer	\$713,299	\$102,967	17%
Peabody	\$1,839,235	\$252,813	16%
Pentucket	\$615,031	\$107,374	21%
Petersham	\$33,167	\$4,611	16%
Pioneer Valley	\$415,605	\$62,836	18%
Pittsfield	\$3,820,006	\$640,338	20%
Plymouth	\$3,021,303	\$537,864	22%
Provincetown	\$129,702	\$15,697	14%
Quabbin	\$896,339	\$140,910	19%
Quaboag Regional	\$631,482	\$89,102	16%
Quincy	\$3,966,689	\$331,522	9%
Ralph C Mahar	\$358,428	\$54,966	18%
Randolph	\$1,504,898	\$152,119	11%
Reading	\$637,685	\$110,438	21%
Revere	\$3,163,094	\$482,362	18%
Rochester	\$129,122	\$22,357	21%
Rockland	\$1,243,240	\$216,118	21%
Rockport	\$288,567	\$37,499	15%
Salem	\$3,118,403	\$498,507	19%
Sandwich	\$922,066	\$164,605	22%
Saugus	\$727,359	\$127,597	21%
Scituate	\$693,656	\$114,843	20%
Seekonk	\$537,542	\$94,383	21%
Sharon	\$797,030	\$144,977	22%
Sherborn	\$64,087	\$11,570	22%
Shirley	\$265,677	\$38,140	17%
Shrewsbury	\$994,214	\$175,028	21%
Silver Lake	\$535,812	\$85,389	19%
Somerset	\$531,198	\$74,780	16%
Somerville	\$4,622,340	\$848,738	22%
South Hadley	\$701,062	\$99,259	16%
Southern Berkshire	\$543,948	\$82,543	18%
Springfield	\$26,081,915	\$5,918,214	29%
Stoneham	\$821,274	\$146,508	22%
Stoughton	\$1,290,420	\$214,809	20%
Sudbury	\$396,484	\$66,697	20%
Sutton	\$334,810	\$54,070	19%
Swampscott	\$448,902	\$61,194	16%
Swansea	\$787,070	\$136,177	21%
Tantasqua	\$429,241	\$70,086	20%
Taunton	\$3,672,833	\$653,851	22%

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary

<u>District</u>	<u>Total 2002</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Tewksbury	\$832,791	\$122,418	17%
Triton	\$958,817	\$160,319	20%
Truro	\$60,454	\$5,390	10%
Tyngsborough	\$589,784	\$104,748	22%
Uxbridge	\$590,080	\$97,151	20%
Wachusett	\$1,334,132	\$183,817	16%
Wakefield	\$905,856	\$149,527	20%
Walpole	\$776,870	\$126,591	19%
Waltham	\$2,144,484	\$380,522	22%
Ware	\$869,128	\$147,184	20%
Wareham	\$1,372,284	\$150,016	12%
Watertown	\$1,086,880	\$172,504	19%
Wellesley	\$756,467	\$115,854	18%
West Boylston	\$252,273	\$41,892	20%
Westborough	\$584,982	\$83,390	17%
Westfield	\$2,720,315	\$415,380	18%
Westford	\$546,277	\$101,342	23%
Weston	\$434,221	\$72,367	20%
Westport	\$474,748	\$55,003	13%
Westwood	\$619,268	\$98,299	19%
Weymouth	\$2,028,584	\$269,462	15%
Whitman-Hanson	\$1,182,191	\$186,504	19%
Williamstown	\$133,848	\$9,926	8%
Wilmington	\$658,229	\$97,575	17%
Winchendon	\$730,340	\$105,700	17%
Winchester	\$634,042	\$118,133	23%
Winthrop	\$689,081	\$83,104	14%
Worcester	\$20,330,843	\$4,423,117	28%
Wrentham	\$246,077	\$41,046	20%
* Limited English proficient child data not available.			

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I	IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education				
			2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase		
Abington	6.6%	\$173,660	\$24,700	\$336,768	\$53,582	\$57,285	\$17,911	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Acton	6.1%	\$118,750	\$16,910	\$355,858	\$48,367	\$38,475	\$12,599	0.2%	\$14,700	\$14,700
Acton-Boxborough	2.8%	\$40,470	\$1,330	\$322,989	\$46,285	\$27,265	\$5,783	*	*	*
Acushnet	9.9%	\$154,660	\$5,890	\$151,802	\$27,730	\$39,425	\$15,503	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Adams-Cheshire	16.3%	\$387,790	\$49,495	\$313,531	\$48,914	\$93,575	\$24,296	*	*	*
Agawam	10.8%	\$454,195	\$64,885	\$766,980	\$92,415	\$125,020	\$39,144	0.0%	\$0	-\$16,380
Amesbury	9.8%	\$272,365	\$38,000	\$442,603	\$64,562	\$89,205	\$21,336	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Amherst	20.3%	\$492,100	\$70,680	\$286,665	\$41,617	\$90,155	\$30,895	0.2%	\$12,500	-\$1,471
Amherst-Pelham	11.0%	\$191,710	\$8,360	\$335,193	\$44,040	\$57,570	\$13,082	*	*	*
Andover	3.3%	\$174,135	\$6,555	\$816,164	\$159,534	\$108,110	\$27,837	0.3%	\$19,500	\$19,500
Arlington	9.5%	\$472,435	\$67,545	\$825,230	\$125,143	\$133,095	\$41,958	0.3%	\$21,200	\$21,200
Ashburnham-Westm	10.4%	\$260,395	\$37,145	\$352,196	\$59,494	\$64,600	\$23,085	*	*	*
Ashland	2.4%	\$92,055	-\$16,245	\$316,492	\$55,395	\$42,560	\$6,843	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Athol-Royalston	23.5%	\$736,345	\$112,290	\$343,148	\$53,254	\$131,290	\$43,222	*	*	*
Attleboro	13.1%	\$896,135	\$131,290	\$1,006,084	\$178,034	\$256,120	\$69,064	0.6%	\$41,200	\$41,200
Auburn	3.4%	\$74,860	\$2,850	\$299,248	\$52,401	\$56,430	\$11,643	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Ayer	17.0%	\$217,645	\$26,980	\$193,183	\$30,563	\$57,475	\$14,379	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Barnstable	12.4%	\$980,590	-\$14,060	\$1,031,549	\$159,068	\$262,580	\$59,797	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Bedford	0.6%	\$0	\$0	\$312,470	\$43,618	\$31,255	\$5,411	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Belchertown	9.2%	\$180,025	\$25,745	\$329,714	\$48,728	\$56,050	\$16,395	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Bellingham	7.9%	\$213,845	\$30,590	\$472,896	\$57,302	\$57,855	\$20,481	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Belmont	4.9%	\$143,165	\$5,320	\$538,230	\$87,649	\$75,715	\$18,627	0.3%	\$18,700	\$18,700
Berkley	9.6%	\$87,685	\$12,540	\$148,034	\$18,865	\$19,285	\$6,263	*	*	*
Berlin	5.4%	\$12,825	\$1,900	\$34,745	\$4,836	\$5,225	\$1,305	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Berlin-Boylston	3.1%	\$10,545	\$380	\$61,789	\$8,662	\$6,460	\$1,790	*	*	*
Beverly	10.9%	\$640,395	\$90,535	\$869,797	\$146,715	\$173,660	\$52,896	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Billerica	2.1%	\$148,960	-\$26,315	\$902,892	\$130,684	\$114,000	\$26,857	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Blackstone-Millville	11.6%	\$228,475	\$32,680	\$307,324	\$48,062	\$56,335	\$19,517	*	*	*
Boston	36.7%	\$40,544,670	\$10,428,435	\$13,865,076	\$2,195,349	\$7,288,400	\$2,005,707	19.9%	\$1,877,153	\$784,202
Bourne	12.2%	\$417,050	\$41,420	\$347,475	\$63,197	\$94,335	\$29,992	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Boxborough	3.1%	\$8,930	\$285	\$66,402	\$12,338	\$7,600	\$1,451	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Boylston	3.6%	\$10,545	\$0	\$58,542	\$7,567	\$5,605	\$1,672	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Braintree	7.4%	\$366,415	\$49,685	\$843,728	\$133,859	\$128,155	\$35,783	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Bridgewater-Raynham	5.7%	\$319,865	\$45,695	\$834,570	\$124,940	\$122,740	\$34,153	*	*	*
Brockton	29.5%	\$7,099,065	\$1,182,275	\$2,714,918	\$500,003	\$1,496,725	\$374,104	3.8%	\$244,800	\$157,214

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I	IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education				
			2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase		
Brookline	12.3%	\$778,715	\$119,985	\$1,129,951	\$181,864	\$206,625	\$65,407	1.5%	\$96,600	\$33,873
Burlington	5.0%	\$190,095	\$27,170	\$532,269	\$77,337	\$68,970	\$21,760	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Cambridge	18.9%	\$2,113,180	\$326,420	\$1,766,853	\$242,196	\$483,740	\$130,737	2.2%	\$441,800	\$14,227
Canton	1.7%	\$0	\$0	\$463,121	\$64,249	\$52,630	\$11,179	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Carlisle	1.5%	\$0	\$0	\$102,047	\$15,711	\$8,740	\$2,322	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Carver	10.1%	\$252,225	\$36,100	\$386,162	\$48,168	\$72,675	\$21,687	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Central Berkshire	12.5%	\$347,130	\$38,000	\$360,413	\$57,672	\$84,075	\$25,509	*	\$0	\$0
Chatham	13.3%	\$108,775	\$15,580	\$89,513	\$16,603	\$24,890	\$8,630	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Chelsea	45.2%	\$3,210,145	\$789,450	\$901,240	\$189,936	\$676,970	\$160,535	3.4%	\$224,400	\$146,160
Chicopee	17.4%	\$1,871,880	\$291,270	\$1,468,493	\$220,114	\$479,940	\$117,242	0.7%	\$46,100	\$46,100
Clarksburg	8.9%	\$29,640	\$3,325	\$36,455	\$4,706	\$8,360	\$2,526	*	\$0	\$0
Clinton	14.7%	\$304,950	\$40,185	\$332,777	\$50,640	\$95,475	\$23,834	0.2%	\$10,800	-\$4,809
Cohasset	3.3%	\$36,575	\$1,330	\$185,035	\$26,582	\$20,330	\$5,883	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Concord-Carlisle	4.9%	\$35,815	-\$190	\$158,324	\$33,995	\$31,065	\$4,399	*	\$0	\$0
Danvers	7.4%	\$286,045	\$40,850	\$624,743	\$111,014	\$97,565	\$27,221	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Dartmouth	9.4%	\$438,615	\$62,700	\$600,412	\$103,861	\$113,335	\$40,022	0.2%	\$14,400	\$14,400
Dedham	8.1%	\$275,975	\$36,670	\$528,483	\$85,066	\$82,175	\$26,224	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Dennis-Yarmouth	26.3%	\$1,599,135	\$265,050	\$586,572	\$102,183	\$229,900	\$91,390	*	\$0	\$0
Dighton-Rehoboth	1.9%	\$0	\$0	\$455,807	\$65,666	\$52,345	\$10,718	*	\$0	\$0
Dover	5.2%	\$23,750	\$3,420	\$92,066	\$13,934	\$8,645	\$2,745	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Dover-Sherborn	3.8%	\$27,645	\$1,045	\$124,123	\$19,628	\$13,300	\$4,162	*	\$0	\$0
Dracut	6.0%	\$273,220	\$39,045	\$626,863	\$59,664	\$96,900	\$27,487	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Duxbury	3.9%	\$110,675	\$4,180	\$444,305	\$66,379	\$45,125	\$16,054	0.0%	\$0	\$0
East Bridgewater	8.5%	\$207,385	\$29,545	\$312,760	\$49,898	\$51,300	\$19,276	0.0%	\$0	\$0
East Longmeadow	5.1%	\$112,385	\$16,055	\$538,074	\$58,276	\$55,005	\$12,793	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Easthampton	5.8%	\$233,795	-\$21,375	\$341,205	\$57,726	\$74,290	\$15,606	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Easton	8.8%	\$310,650	\$44,365	\$546,021	\$73,676	\$69,730	\$28,833	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Everett	17.8%	\$1,451,980	-\$38,190	\$940,955	\$158,162	\$330,885	\$67,314	1.1%	\$72,900	\$26,264
Fairhaven	8.7%	\$240,350	\$20,615	\$327,644	\$55,091	\$89,585	\$20,851	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Fall River	29.0%	\$6,004,095	\$1,176,195	\$2,151,774	\$382,797	\$1,095,920	\$320,449	3.3%	\$218,000	\$169,052
Falmouth	19.7%	\$1,156,055	\$165,015	\$658,681	\$109,917	\$185,345	\$71,187	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Farmington River Reg	21.6%	\$75,810	\$10,830	\$47,269	\$3,939	\$9,025	\$4,734	*	\$0	\$0
Fitchburg	28.6%	\$2,513,035	\$424,080	\$1,079,871	\$205,721	\$557,650	\$138,402	1.5%	\$98,300	\$10,039
Foxborough	9.5%	\$239,400	\$34,200	\$447,659	\$60,621	\$62,225	\$20,651	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Framingham	12.0%	\$1,107,225	\$134,140	\$1,377,528	\$228,641	\$395,865	\$81,321	1.9%	\$120,700	\$43,327
Franklin	3.3%	\$134,045	-\$23,655	\$682,702	\$107,964	\$78,565	\$18,136	0.0%	\$0	\$0

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I	IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education			
			2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase	
Freetown-Lakeville	4.1%	\$76,475	\$2,850	\$241,728	\$36,350	\$42,845	\$10,382	*	*
Frontier	3.6%	\$21,470	-\$3,800	\$171,379	\$30,099	\$24,510	\$2,907	*	*
Gardner	23.2%	\$903,640	\$136,230	\$552,023	\$85,760	\$158,365	\$54,517	0.0%	\$0
Gateway	10.6%	\$211,660	\$20,805	\$255,483	\$34,275	\$61,370	\$15,872	*	*
Georgetown	9.8%	\$123,310	\$17,575	\$184,115	\$30,686	\$27,645	\$11,023	0.0%	\$0
Gill-Montague	20.2%	\$405,555	\$56,715	\$303,684	\$37,820	\$85,785	\$24,305	*	*
Gloucester	10.6%	\$475,285	\$66,405	\$680,140	\$100,906	\$155,515	\$39,705	0.0%	\$0
Grafton	6.0%	\$139,840	\$20,045	\$295,205	\$48,212	\$48,355	\$14,046	0.0%	\$0
Granby	6.8%	\$71,250	\$10,165	\$153,888	\$22,605	\$27,645	\$6,993	0.0%	\$0
Granville	8.7%	\$24,700	\$3,515	\$41,244	\$5,438	\$7,220	\$2,261	0.0%	\$0
Greenfield	22.2%	\$951,710	\$91,580	\$460,883	\$69,664	\$159,695	\$51,269	0.0%	-\$6,841
Hadley	2.9%	\$15,485	\$570	\$94,072	\$17,966	\$15,295	\$2,537	0.0%	\$0
Hamilton-Wenham	6.4%	\$120,650	\$17,290	\$286,303	\$50,686	\$37,240	\$12,308	*	*
Hampden-Wilbraham	4.7%	\$126,920	\$4,750	\$609,653	\$85,962	\$73,720	\$16,521	*	*
Hampshire	0.7%	\$0	\$0	\$138,789	\$17,335	\$19,570	\$2,142	*	*
Hanover	3.3%	\$74,860	\$2,850	\$359,153	\$55,838	\$39,900	\$11,512	0.0%	\$0
Harvard	5.6%	\$136,135	\$19,475	\$146,011	\$25,601	\$25,935	\$14,846	0.0%	\$0
Harwich	9.2%	\$139,840	\$20,045	\$251,884	\$37,301	\$47,405	\$12,429	0.0%	\$0
Hatfield	3.4%	\$15,485	\$570	\$65,243	\$9,651	\$9,215	\$2,270	0.0%	\$0
Haverhill	17.3%	\$1,817,350	\$264,670	\$1,589,193	\$213,341	\$405,840	\$110,260	0.9%	\$61,000
Hingham	2.0%	\$67,545	\$2,565	\$522,203	\$91,782	\$58,995	\$13,878	0.0%	\$0
Holbrook	10.8%	\$264,100	\$16,435	\$243,245	\$36,860	\$53,295	\$16,537	0.0%	\$0
Holliston	0.5%	\$0	\$0	\$525,586	\$62,189	\$37,050	\$7,689	0.0%	\$0
Holyoke	52.0%	\$6,148,685	\$1,636,090	\$1,479,939	\$247,607	\$898,320	\$289,429	3.3%	\$213,600
Hopedale	0.9%	\$0	\$0	\$172,846	\$22,292	\$15,675	\$3,153	0.0%	\$0
Hopkinton	6.5%	\$116,090	\$16,625	\$363,958	\$56,577	\$38,665	\$11,759	0.0%	\$0
Hudson	5.0%	\$140,695	\$20,045	\$496,887	\$65,749	\$71,155	\$15,922	0.4%	\$27,000
Hull	16.3%	\$346,275	\$44,270	\$232,318	\$31,405	\$64,600	\$23,121	0.0%	\$0
Ipswich	6.3%	\$116,945	\$16,720	\$271,932	\$41,419	\$41,800	\$11,902	0.0%	\$0
King Philip	4.9%	\$70,015	\$2,660	\$222,295	\$34,915	\$27,170	\$8,681	*	*
Kingston	8.2%	\$84,075	\$12,065	\$187,232	\$33,328	\$38,190	\$7,985	0.0%	\$0
Lawrence	47.8%	\$10,505,955	\$2,671,590	\$1,994,065	\$436,036	\$1,635,330	\$514,819	8.8%	\$572,300
Lee	5.6%	\$70,680	-\$3,135	\$188,061	\$25,304	\$37,715	\$6,094	*	*
Lenox	8.6%	\$65,835	\$9,405	\$139,816	\$20,508	\$19,665	\$5,292	0.0%	\$0
Leominster	13.9%	\$899,270	\$132,905	\$1,114,026	\$161,286	\$281,770	\$69,970	0.6%	\$36,700
Lexington	5.2%	\$244,910	\$34,960	\$966,486	\$140,842	\$101,650	\$25,734	0.4%	-\$2,512

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I	IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education				
			2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase		
Lincoln-Sudbury	1.9%	\$0	\$163,856	\$24,734	\$17,670	\$3,967	*	*		
Littleton	6.0%	\$59,565	\$184,765	\$34,438	\$27,835	\$7,347	0.0%	\$0	\$0	
Longmeadow	2.7%	\$64,980	\$0	\$493,960	\$73,772	\$54,435	\$12,115	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Lowell	35.6%	\$9,207,685	\$1,553,250	\$2,764,531	\$516,929	\$1,549,830	\$462,824	7.3%	\$635,077	\$410,213
Ludlow	4.5%	\$122,835	\$4,560	\$520,240	\$67,446	\$77,045	\$16,597	0.2%	\$13,900	\$13,900
Lunenburg	8.8%	\$154,470	\$22,135	\$232,276	\$42,522	\$40,185	\$14,189	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Lynn	29.5%	\$6,395,590	\$252,415	\$2,682,031	\$471,770	\$1,410,275	\$295,175	4.5%	\$296,000	\$207,932
Lynnfield	4.8%	\$83,790	\$3,135	\$256,192	\$46,883	\$33,535	\$10,824	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Malden	14.2%	\$1,476,205	-\$96,995	\$1,060,717	\$172,433	\$351,500	\$80,706	1.5%	\$188,319	\$39,607
Mansfield	8.9%	\$65,835	\$9,405	\$595,542	\$87,736	\$82,460	\$25,534	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Marblehead	2.8%	\$71,630	\$2,660	\$436,140	\$68,038	\$52,725	\$12,294	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Marion	6.1%	\$28,310	\$3,990	\$63,346	\$10,247	\$10,640	\$2,863	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Marlborough	8.0%	\$374,585	-\$7,885	\$870,730	\$115,407	\$162,070	\$32,165	0.4%	\$28,700	-\$2,615
Marshfield	3.1%	\$145,825	-\$25,650	\$606,860	\$93,674	\$87,210	\$19,593	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Marthas Vineyard	5.7%	\$28,310	\$3,990	\$141,509	\$16,486	\$18,905	\$2,948	*	*	*
Mashpee	11.7%	\$229,520	-\$20,900	\$291,532	\$48,736	\$64,220	\$12,773	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Mattapoiset	4.5%	\$25,175	-\$95	\$75,450	\$12,036	\$13,395	\$3,517	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Maynard	11.3%	\$176,320	\$26,125	\$215,182	\$32,689	\$46,645	\$15,418	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Medfield	1.0%	\$0	\$0	\$330,089	\$56,806	\$33,725	\$6,627	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Medford	12.7%	\$931,570	\$144,020	\$849,951	\$139,129	\$226,480	\$74,663	0.4%	\$28,900	\$1,632
Medway	6.2%	\$121,505	\$17,290	\$382,824	\$53,227	\$40,375	\$12,939	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Melrose	6.1%	\$256,785	\$36,670	\$550,037	\$79,269	\$81,320	\$26,692	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Mendon-Upton	2.4%	\$33,345	\$1,235	\$284,429	\$48,109	\$36,290	\$6,368	*	*	*
Methuen	15.9%	\$1,376,455	\$203,870	\$1,070,432	\$186,846	\$322,430	\$82,096	0.7%	\$46,600	-\$109,715
Middleborough	10.6%	\$416,005	\$56,240	\$530,033	\$79,404	\$111,055	\$32,871	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Milford	9.6%	\$438,520	\$58,710	\$685,348	\$102,136	\$143,545	\$38,446	0.3%	\$20,100	\$20,100
Millbury	4.5%	\$102,885	-\$18,240	\$279,345	\$44,978	\$49,020	\$10,083	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Mills	5.2%	\$68,495	\$9,785	\$199,376	\$27,004	\$30,115	\$7,765	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Milton	2.5%	\$115,235	-\$20,330	\$764,218	\$129,464	\$90,820	\$16,814	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Mohawk Trail	15.5%	\$337,440	\$42,180	\$295,025	\$40,728	\$80,465	\$22,347	*	*	*
Monson	4.1%	\$60,895	-\$5,605	\$243,421	\$30,208	\$35,150	\$6,896	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Mount Greylock	7.4%	\$45,695	\$6,555	\$102,740	\$18,065	\$16,720	\$4,417	*	*	*
Nahant	2.7%	\$15,010	-\$2,660	\$60,042	\$4,364	\$4,085	\$2,033	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Narragansett	7.5%	\$127,585	\$16,625	\$233,457	\$33,733	\$48,735	\$11,556	*	*	*
Nashoba	5.8%	\$165,395	\$23,655	\$488,328	\$76,993	\$54,720	\$11,402	*	*	*
Natick	4.8%	\$179,835	\$6,745	\$635,008	\$99,639	\$84,455	\$16,914	0.0%	\$0	\$0

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I	IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education				
			2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase		
Nauset	10.4%	\$148,960	\$21,280	\$216,842	\$37,136	\$49,780	\$13,061	*	*	
Needham	5.4%	\$245,765	\$35,055	\$661,670	\$108,109	\$81,795	\$25,369	0.2%	\$15,600	\$15,600
New Bedford	36.3%	\$8,481,885	\$1,767,475	\$2,515,860	\$442,388	\$1,437,350	\$449,423	2.2%	\$146,100	\$146,100
New Salem-Wendell	12.4%	\$33,250	-\$2,755	\$43,598	\$6,232	\$12,445	\$2,039	*	*	*
Newburyport	11.6%	\$290,605	\$41,515	\$331,090	\$55,376	\$57,855	\$23,035	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Newton	4.3%	\$426,360	\$15,960	\$1,789,007	\$311,527	\$245,100	\$57,654	1.7%	\$109,400	\$45,228
Norfolk	1.7%	\$0	\$0	\$164,050	\$24,270	\$17,860	\$3,949	0.0%	\$0	\$0
North Adams	25.7%	\$777,480	\$126,730	\$396,992	\$57,111	\$154,375	\$44,533	0.0%	\$0	\$0
North Andover	2.4%	\$104,025	-\$18,430	\$581,644	\$101,416	\$74,290	\$16,597	0.0%	\$0	\$0
North Attleborough	3.7%	\$147,250	-\$22,135	\$652,240	\$99,447	\$95,950	\$21,043	0.0%	\$0	\$0
North Brookfield	10.3%	\$99,275	\$13,110	\$108,753	\$20,445	\$31,920	\$8,088	0.0%	\$0	\$0
North Middlesex	5.1%	\$248,520	\$35,435	\$633,795	\$98,170	\$95,095	\$27,452	*	*	*
North Reading	3.5%	\$63,460	\$2,375	\$306,903	\$49,158	\$35,435	\$9,537	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Northampton	19.1%	\$888,345	\$121,885	\$522,398	\$76,825	\$147,535	\$52,914	0.2%	\$14,300	\$14,300
Northboro-Southboro	2.0%	\$0	\$0	\$151,720	\$26,998	\$28,500	\$3,476	*	*	*
Norton	7.9%	\$201,020	\$28,690	\$462,341	\$67,517	\$70,300	\$19,037	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Norwell	2.7%	\$46,360	\$1,710	\$239,421	\$39,812	\$26,030	\$8,233	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Norwood	5.9%	\$234,840	-\$4,465	\$598,559	\$89,635	\$95,000	\$25,060	0.4%	\$26,200	\$4,906
Old Rochester	3.6%	\$52,535	-\$9,310	\$161,930	\$32,915	\$27,455	\$6,708	*	*	*
Orange	27.5%	\$316,825	\$54,055	\$195,171	\$22,577	\$64,980	\$17,872	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Palmer	12.8%	\$266,665	\$31,160	\$356,099	\$51,798	\$90,535	\$20,009	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Peabody	6.2%	\$458,470	\$46,740	\$1,148,615	\$173,144	\$209,950	\$45,706	0.3%	\$22,200	-\$12,777
Pentucket	5.3%	\$149,910	\$21,470	\$409,546	\$70,900	\$55,575	\$15,004	*	*	*
Petersham	9.9%	\$10,450	\$1,330	\$19,202	\$2,417	\$3,515	\$864	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Pioneer Valley	11.0%	\$136,705	\$19,380	\$235,960	\$31,752	\$42,940	\$11,704	*	*	*
Pittsfield	23.5%	\$2,106,150	\$332,500	\$1,318,656	\$184,050	\$395,200	\$123,788	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Plymouth	14.0%	\$1,391,750	\$234,650	\$1,302,753	\$198,829	\$326,800	\$104,385	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Provincetown	12.2%	\$52,535	\$4,750	\$64,152	\$7,339	\$13,015	\$3,608	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Quabbin	13.8%	\$357,580	\$48,070	\$449,554	\$72,207	\$89,205	\$20,633	*	*	*
Quabog Regional	16.0%	\$286,615	\$36,195	\$285,397	\$34,302	\$59,470	\$18,605	*	*	*
Quincy	13.1%	\$1,953,865	-\$69,730	\$1,464,379	\$240,459	\$447,545	\$108,456	1.6%	\$100,900	\$52,337
Ralph C Mahar	20.3%	\$185,630	\$26,030	\$132,518	\$18,042	\$40,280	\$10,894	*	*	*
Randolph	9.2%	\$632,890	-\$2,185	\$636,558	\$101,913	\$196,650	\$36,812	0.6%	\$38,800	\$15,579
Reading	1.7%	\$0	\$0	\$576,315	\$96,794	\$61,370	\$13,644	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Revere	23.4%	\$1,686,250	\$147,630	\$918,059	\$172,496	\$465,785	\$101,997	1.4%	\$93,000	\$60,239
Rochester	9.2%	\$51,205	\$7,315	\$65,092	\$10,484	\$12,825	\$4,558	0.0%	\$0	\$0

Resources for Reform: A District-by-District Summary of Major Programs

District	Census Poverty	Title I		IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education		
		2002	Increase	2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase
Rockland	19.5%	\$721,810	\$99,655	\$403,155	\$71,211	\$118,275	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Rockport	5.9%	\$63,080	\$9,025	\$202,117	\$21,924	\$23,370	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Salem	24.3%	\$1,515,250	\$224,295	\$917,591	\$129,969	\$311,600	1.1%	\$373,962	\$54,423
Sandwich	10.8%	\$354,540	\$50,635	\$490,576	\$83,581	\$76,950	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Saugus	5.8%	\$229,330	\$32,775	\$417,659	\$70,454	\$80,370	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Scituate	7.6%	\$226,575	\$32,300	\$406,471	\$66,506	\$60,610	0.0%	\$0	-\$6,263
Seekonk	8.3%	\$207,385	\$29,545	\$279,617	\$45,249	\$50,540	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Sharon	8.1%	\$258,590	\$36,955	\$464,045	\$71,626	\$62,795	0.2%	\$11,600	\$11,600
Sherborn	2.1%	\$10,355	\$950	\$47,842	\$8,902	\$5,890	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Shirley	8.2%	\$92,625	\$12,540	\$146,072	\$17,319	\$26,980	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Shrewsbury	3.9%	\$136,705	\$5,130	\$746,359	\$133,683	\$94,050	0.3%	\$17,100	\$17,100
Silver Lake	4.0%	\$93,575	\$3,515	\$388,277	\$68,844	\$53,960	*	*	*
Somerset	4.1%	\$104,120	\$3,895	\$371,313	\$58,349	\$55,765	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Somerville	25.9%	\$2,621,905	\$431,585	\$1,255,035	\$194,344	\$585,200	2.5%	\$160,200	\$95,642
South Hadley	9.3%	\$214,700	\$30,685	\$426,037	\$49,260	\$60,325	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Southern Berkshire	18.6%	\$252,130	\$34,200	\$239,663	\$32,647	\$52,155	*	*	*
Springfield	43.0%	\$16,436,710	\$3,903,360	\$5,033,832	\$902,389	\$3,107,355	5.9%	\$1,504,018	\$313,774
Stoneham	10.4%	\$338,105	\$48,385	\$407,549	\$68,104	\$75,620	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Stoughton	11.5%	\$504,450	\$72,105	\$648,070	\$88,852	\$127,300	0.2%	\$10,600	\$10,600
Sudbury	1.5%	\$0	\$0	\$358,294	\$59,258	\$38,190	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Sutton	5.7%	\$83,125	\$11,875	\$222,900	\$33,176	\$28,785	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Swampscott	4.0%	\$74,005	\$2,755	\$336,327	\$47,782	\$38,570	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Swansea	12.3%	\$349,980	\$49,970	\$357,005	\$56,876	\$80,085	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Tantasqua	12.3%	\$159,885	\$22,800	\$221,666	\$33,995	\$47,690	*	*	*
Taunton	16.1%	\$1,692,425	\$275,215	\$1,528,183	\$225,784	\$402,325	0.8%	\$49,900	\$49,900
Tewksbury	4.3%	\$176,510	\$6,555	\$575,721	\$93,765	\$80,560	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Triton	11.0%	\$349,980	\$49,115	\$498,067	\$85,926	\$110,770	*	*	*
Truro	10.7%	\$24,415	\$2,185	\$31,194	\$1,444	\$4,845	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Tyngsborough	11.8%	\$204,725	\$29,260	\$333,664	\$57,834	\$51,395	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Uxbridge	9.7%	\$188,195	\$26,885	\$341,655	\$53,993	\$60,230	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Wachusett	4.7%	\$280,725	\$10,545	\$942,447	\$139,442	\$110,960	*	*	*
Wakefield	7.7%	\$290,605	\$41,515	\$536,116	\$80,048	\$79,135	*	*	*
Walpole	5.2%	\$178,220	\$25,460	\$536,805	\$82,578	\$61,845	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Waltham	12.2%	\$786,220	\$110,580	\$1,019,739	\$133,712	\$244,625	1.4%	\$93,900	\$72,413
Ware	23.3%	\$512,525	\$77,710	\$258,373	\$39,486	\$98,230	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Wareham	16.3%	\$677,065	\$21,185	\$512,249	\$86,993	\$182,970	0.0%	\$0	\$0

District	Census Poverty	Title I		IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education			
		2002	Increase	2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase	
Watertown	12.1%	\$394,915	\$53,295	\$554,720	\$64,065	\$99,845	\$30,366	0.6%	\$37,400	\$24,778
Wellesley	2.7%	\$94,335	\$3,515	\$695,157	\$95,556	\$66,975	\$16,783	0.0%	\$0	\$0
West Boylston	8.1%	\$76,760	\$10,925	\$153,473	\$23,527	\$22,040	\$7,440	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westborough	4.8%	\$100,035	\$3,705	\$421,272	\$65,495	\$51,775	\$12,985	0.2%	\$11,900	\$1,205
Westfield	15.9%	\$1,186,170	\$170,335	\$1,198,570	\$166,144	\$296,875	\$76,719	0.6%	\$38,700	\$2,182
Westford	1.4%	\$0	\$0	\$488,897	\$69,905	\$57,380	\$11,437	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Weston	3.5%	\$50,445	\$1,900	\$343,876	\$62,870	\$39,900	\$7,597	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westport	5.7%	\$148,200	-\$3,705	\$264,703	\$45,158	\$61,845	\$13,550	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westwood	5.1%	\$118,750	\$16,910	\$454,253	\$68,676	\$46,265	\$12,713	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Weymouth	7.9%	\$613,130	\$30,780	\$1,194,864	\$181,155	\$220,500	\$57,527	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Whitman-Hanson	8.4%	\$411,255	\$55,480	\$653,801	\$94,144	\$117,135	\$36,880	*	*	*
Williamstown	4.2%	\$39,330	-\$6,935	\$80,838	\$14,030	\$13,680	\$2,831	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Wilmington	3.5%	\$100,035	\$3,705	\$499,864	\$79,121	\$58,330	\$14,749	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winchendon	14.3%	\$270,180	\$35,815	\$372,950	\$49,888	\$87,210	\$19,997	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winchester	5.1%	\$166,345	\$23,845	\$412,217	\$75,334	\$55,480	\$18,954	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winthrop	9.7%	\$238,545	\$25,935	\$380,046	\$46,633	\$70,490	\$19,208	0.0%	\$0	-\$8,672
Worcester	35.5%	\$12,603,175	\$2,791,765	\$4,801,411	\$821,066	\$2,304,985	\$648,387	5.0%	\$621,272	\$161,899
Wrentham	7.0%	\$72,200	\$10,355	\$153,262	\$23,632	\$20,615	\$7,059	0.0%	\$0	\$0

District	Census Poverty	Title I		IDEA		Teacher Quality	Bilingual Education			
		2002	Increase	2002	Increase		LEP %	2002	Increase	
Watertown	12.1%	\$394,915	\$53,295	\$554,720	\$64,065	\$99,845	\$30,366	0.6%	\$37,400	\$24,778
Wellesley	2.7%	\$94,335	\$3,515	\$695,157	\$95,556	\$66,975	\$16,783	0.0%	\$0	\$0
West Boylston	8.1%	\$76,760	\$10,925	\$153,473	\$23,527	\$22,040	\$7,440	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westborough	4.8%	\$100,035	\$3,705	\$421,272	\$65,495	\$51,775	\$12,985	0.2%	\$11,900	\$1,205
Westfield	15.9%	\$1,186,170	\$170,335	\$1,198,570	\$166,144	\$296,875	\$76,719	0.6%	\$38,700	\$2,182
Westford	1.4%	\$0	\$0	\$488,897	\$69,905	\$57,380	\$11,437	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Weston	3.5%	\$50,445	\$1,900	\$343,876	\$62,870	\$39,900	\$7,597	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westport	5.7%	\$148,200	-\$3,705	\$264,703	\$45,158	\$61,845	\$13,550	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Westwood	5.1%	\$118,750	\$16,910	\$454,253	\$68,676	\$46,265	\$12,713	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Weymouth	7.9%	\$613,130	\$30,780	\$1,194,864	\$181,155	\$220,500	\$57,527	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Whitman-Hanson	8.4%	\$411,255	\$55,480	\$653,801	\$94,144	\$117,135	\$36,880	*	*	*
Williamstown	4.2%	\$39,330	-\$6,935	\$80,838	\$14,030	\$13,680	\$2,831	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Wilmington	3.5%	\$100,035	\$3,705	\$499,864	\$79,121	\$58,330	\$14,749	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winchendon	14.3%	\$270,180	\$35,815	\$372,950	\$49,888	\$87,210	\$19,997	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winchester	5.1%	\$166,345	\$23,845	\$412,217	\$75,334	\$55,480	\$18,954	0.0%	\$0	\$0
Winthrop	9.7%	\$238,545	\$25,935	\$380,046	\$46,633	\$70,490	\$19,208	0.0%	\$0	-\$8,672
Worcester	35.5%	\$12,603,175	\$2,791,765	\$4,801,411	\$821,066	\$2,304,985	\$648,387	5.0%	\$621,272	\$161,899
Wrentham	7.0%	\$72,200	\$10,355	\$153,262	\$23,632	\$20,615	\$7,059	0.0%	\$0	\$0

MASSACHUSETTS IMPACT OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

MASSACHUSETTS RESOURCES

Selected Program Summary (School Year 2002-2003)

- Title I: \$220.8 million (an increase of \$39.8 million)
- IDEA (special education): \$191.9 million (an increase of \$28.2 million)
- Teacher Quality: \$52.5 million (an increase of \$13.9 million)
- Bilingual Education: \$9.7 million (an increase of \$3.0 million)
- After-School: \$21.2 million (an increase of \$7.2 million)
- Education Technology: \$12.8 million (an increase of \$1.0 million)
- **All Federal K-12 funding: \$825.9 million (an increase of \$113.6 million)**

***Major K-12 Federal Resources by Congressional District:**

1 st Congressional District:	\$35.8 million (an increase of \$6.7 million)
2 nd Congressional District:	\$43.4 million (an increase of \$8.6 million)
3 rd Congressional District:	\$44.5 million (an increase of \$8.8 million)
4 th Congressional District:	\$41.0 million (an increase of \$7.9 million)
5 th Congressional District:	\$42.6 million (an increase of \$8.7 million)
6 th Congressional District:	\$31.8 million (an increase of \$4.6 million)
7 th Congressional District:	\$25.1 million (an increase of \$3.5 million)
8 th Congressional District:	\$79.9 million (an increase of \$18.6 million)
9 th Congressional District:	\$90.0 million (an increase of \$20.0 million)
10 th Congressional District:	\$38.0 million (an increase of \$6.0 million)

*School districts crossing Congressional boundaries are counted for all Congressional Districts impacted.

Title I Aid for Disadvantaged Children

2001-2002 School Year: \$220.8 million

2002-2003 School Year: \$181 million (\$39.8 million increase)

Last year, 232,000 disadvantaged children from low-income backgrounds and communities received supplemental educational assistance. Title I programs were provided in 980 out of more than 1,900 Massachusetts elementary and secondary schools. But because of under funding, 624 Massachusetts schools with poverty rates in excess of 30% received zero in Title I education assistance

At the increased funding levels attached to the No Child Left Behind Act, approximately, 51,300 more disadvantaged Massachusetts children will receive supplemental Title I education assistance. Virtually every high poverty, but currently unserved school, will receive Title I assistance. The parents of 104,000 students in 259 schools will be offered the option to choose a different public school and receive supplemental tutoring services before school, after-school, or during the summer.

The new law also dramatically targets the distribution of additional school aid on the neediest populations. A wealth of educational research indicates that children from low income backgrounds residing in low income communities face a “double educational disadvantage.” They have heightened educational needs associated with their own family poverty, and their communities are less able to provide support services because of surrounding fiscal distress. In fact, in part because of surrounding community distress and sometimes negative peer influence, non-poor children attending high poverty schools achieve at lower levels than poor children attending low poverty schools.

High poverty districts will see a 40% increase in their share of additional Massachusetts Title I funds. Previously, high-poverty Massachusetts school districts received 50% of state Title I funding. The new targeting provisions in the No Child Left Behind Act, however, direct 70% of funding *increases* toward high-poverty districts. Even with the strengthened targeting provisions in the new law, however, low-poverty districts will still see at least some increase in Title I aid.

Title I aid to High Poverty Areas*

	2001 (rounded)	2002 (rounded)	% Increase	Additional Needy Children Served
Boston	\$30.1 million	\$40.5 million	35%	+13,330
New Bedford	\$6.7 million	\$8.9 million	33%	+2,820
Worcester	\$9.8 million	\$13.2 million	35%	+4,360

Title I Aid to Low Poverty Areas

	2001 (rounded)	2002 (rounded)	Increase	% Increase
Hanover	\$72,000	\$74,800	\$2,800	4%
Newton	\$410,400	\$426,400	\$16,000	4%
Wellesley	\$90,800	\$94,300	\$3,500	4%

** Due to rounding, above estimates vary from those contained in Table 2.*

Title II: Teacher Quality

2001-2002 School Year: \$38.6 million

2002-2003 School Year: \$52.5 million (\$13.9 million increase)

More than \$74.6 million in federal aid will be dedicated toward reducing class size *and* upgrading the skills of the over 41,000 Massachusetts teachers next year – more than double the amount of federal aid dedicated to teacher recruitment and training last year.

School districts throughout the State will receive \$52.5 million in Title II Teacher Quality grants that can be used to recruit, train, and hire new teachers or provide professional development services to current teachers. In addition, every school will dedicate at least 10% of available Title I funds to professional development activities – an amount that equals \$22.1 million.

Last school year, Massachusetts used the federal Class Size Reduction program to recruit, train, and hire 483 new teachers, 80% of whom were used to reduce class size in grades K-3. The State dedicated two out of every five dollars in Teacher Quality improvement funds – \$16.7 million worth – toward providing professional development services to current teachers throughout the State.

Next year, Massachusetts can be expected to recruit, hire, and train 656 new teachers with Title II Teacher Quality grant funds. If it again uses two out of every five Teacher Quality dollars for professional development services and, as it must, at least 10% of Title I funding for teacher training, almost \$45 million in federal funds will be available next year solely to upgrading the teaching skills of current Massachusetts teachers.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future estimates that a high quality professional development program, which includes subject-matter training, child development and pedagogical training, and year-round mentoring assistance for new teachers costs approximately \$4,000 per teacher. At last year's funding level, approximately 4,175 Massachusetts teachers could have received high quality professional development support. At next year's funding levels, approximately 11,250 Massachusetts teachers could receive high quality professional development services.

Title III: Bilingual and Immigrant Education Aid

2001-2002 School Year: \$6.7 million

2002-2003 School Year: \$9.7 million (\$3 million increase)

There are over 44,800 limited English proficient students enrolled in the Massachusetts public schools, comprising approximately 5% of all students in Massachusetts. At least 52 school districts throughout the Commonwealth offer bilingual education programs to meet the needs of this rapidly growing population, providing academic assistance and language support for students to master English and achieve academically. Bilingual education programs operated by local Massachusetts districts provide language support and instruction in more than 25 native languages and English.

At the increased funding levels attached to the No Child Left Behind Act, Massachusetts schools would receive adequate funding to support the educational needs of an additional 4,255 limited English proficient children in Massachusetts. The increased federal investment could equip fully 78 Massachusetts classrooms with all of the essential elements of a high quality and research-based bilingual education program: bilingual curriculum and materials; language proficiency tests; a fully-certified teacher; and ongoing professional development training to assist teachers in the instruction of limited English proficient students.

Increases provided by the No Child Left Behind Act will make federal funds available for the support and development of bilingual education programs in 52 school districts throughout Massachusetts, including 19 school districts that currently do not receive federal bilingual or immigrant education support.

Title III Aid to Districts with High LEP Enrollments (over 6% LEP)

	2001	2002	Increase	Additional Students Served
Springfield	\$1,190,244	\$1,504,018	\$313,744	477
Boston	\$1,092,951	\$1,877,153	\$784,202	1191
Lowell	\$224,864	\$635,077	\$ 410,213	623

Title III Aid to Districts with Moderate LEP Enrollments (less 5% LEP)

Lynn	\$88,068	\$296,000	\$207,932	316
Chelsea	\$78,240	\$224,400	\$146,160	222
Brockton	\$87,586	\$244,800	\$157,214	239

MASSACHUSETTS REFORM

The example set by Massachusetts educators, administrators, parents, and students has lead the nation in education reform. The No Child Left Behind Act builds upon the practice and promise of the Massachusetts example, and provides needed resources to maintain the Commonwealth's commitment to ensuring high achievement for all students.

Since the enactment of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, Massachusetts has developed high standards in reading, mathematics, and science for the elementary, middle, and high school grades, and in history for the middle and high school grades. Massachusetts has integrated these standards into its curriculum frameworks, and in 2001 Massachusetts standards were rated among the highest in the nation, serving as a model for evaluating standards and assessments in other States.

Now in its 5th year of administration, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) continues to provide valuable information about the performance of individual students, schools, and districts based on Massachusetts academic standards. After having expanded the MCAS program over the past 2 years, the MCAS now includes reading assessments in grades 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10; math assessments in grades 4, 6, 8, and 10; science assessments in grades 5 and 8; and history assessments in grades 5, 8 and 10.

Massachusetts is among 15 States that require and subsidize a teacher induction program for beginning teachers, and the State will soon show the number of teachers that are certified, as well as those teaching without certification, on school report cards. Currently, 72% of middle and high school teachers hold degrees in the subjects they teach.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires all States to assess students annually in grades 3-8, in math and reading, beginning in the 2005-2006 school year. It also invests in professional development and teacher mentoring to confront the challenges of inadequate support for beginning teachers in Massachusetts classrooms, lack of resources for experienced teachers, and lack of opportunities for professional development.

Attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers remains a challenge for Massachusetts, as well as for the nation's schools, and the Commonwealth will have to embark on a concerted recruitment and teacher training effort to comply with the No Child Left Behind Act. Forty percent of all Massachusetts teachers are expected to retire within the next ten years, and Massachusetts faced a 35% increase in retirement rates for teachers in 2001. Support provided under the No Child Left Behind Act will provide Massachusetts with the resources needed to move toward the goal of ensuring that all Massachusetts teachers are highly qualified within 4 years, and that all teachers receive high-quality professional development.

CHALLENGING NEEDS

In preparing the students of today and tomorrow for the 21st Century economy, our public schools confront extraordinary and growing challenges.

Currently, the nation's public schools currently serve the largest and most diverse student body in American history. Enrollment will exceed 53 million this year and grow to more than 94 million by the year 2020. More than 10.3 million children come to schools from households in poverty (defined as household income at less than \$17,100 a year for a family of four). Supplemental Title I education assistance is currently made available fully to only one-third of the nation's poor children.

Forty two percent of all public school teachers in the United States have at least one of the nation's 4.1 million LEP students in their classroom. LEP students are the fastest growing segment of the school-age population. In the last decade, the number of LEP children grew nationally by 104%.

Twenty one percent of LEP students nationally are held back at least once before they reach third grade, and limited English proficiency remains one of the strongest predictors of whether a student will drop out of school. Despite the need, currently only 12% of LEP children are provided services tailored to their language needs under the Bilingual Education Act.

Independent of the demands of growing and diverse enrollment, schools nationally and in Massachusetts face a looming teacher supply crisis. Approximately, 40% of all Massachusetts teachers are over age 50 and expected to retire within the next five years. In 2001 alone, there was a 35% increase in teacher retirement rates. Over the next 10 years, the State will need to recruit, hire, and train more than 16,400 new teachers exclusively due to the aging teaching force.

Massachusetts needs not only to hire and train thousands of new teachers during the next five years, it needs to provide support services to retain newly hired and current teachers. Nearly 10% of all newly hired Massachusetts teachers fail to stay in teaching more than one year. Within 5 years of entering the profession, 50% of Massachusetts teachers leave the field.

The challenges America's public schools confront are only expected to grow during the coming year. In November 2001, a joint U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate Congressional report estimated that next school year, the number of children in poverty will grow by 650,000.

That same November 2001 Congressional report also identified more than \$11 billion in current school year state education budget cuts nationwide and aggregate state budget deficits of \$25 billion. But according to a January 2002 report of the National Conference of State Legislatures, the current year combined state budget deficits have grown to approximately \$40 billion as a result of the downturning economy. As per state constitutional and statutory laws, State budget deficits must be eliminated by either revenue increases or further state budget cuts. According to the United States Department of Education, approximately one-third of state budgets are dedicated to education funding.

Thus, on top of their extraordinary current needs, local public schools find themselves confronting growing child poverty and bleak prospects for increased State funding.

NATIONAL SUMMARY OF POLICY CHANGES TO MAJOR K-12 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Title I Aid for Disadvantaged Children

2001-2002 School Year: \$8.8 billion *nationally*

2002-2003 School Year: \$10.35 billion (\$1.55 billion increase) *nationally*

Established in 1965, the Title I program helps schools meet the additional academic needs of economically and educationally disadvantaged students. The largest single federal education program, Title I provides aid to over 58,000 public schools in more than 90% of the nation's school districts. Over 13.4 million children benefit at least partially from Title I services each year. Due to under funding, only 3.5 million children are fully served by the program.

The nature and content of Title I services are largely controlled by local school districts. In the past, school districts predominantly have chosen to support basic skill instruction in reading and mathematics. In 1994, however, Congress introduced a framework of standards-based reform to the program aimed at ensuring that all students are taught to and learn both basic and advanced skills. States were required to develop rigorous content and performance standards in reading and mathematics, statewide assessments in at least three grades linked to those standards, a process for measuring the progress of schools, and a strategy for turning around failing schools.

The No Child Left Behind Act:

- **Improves and expands the existing system of state standards and assessments.** In order to achieve greater accountability, the No Child Left Behind Act requires States to develop and implement by 2005-2006 new, high quality annual assessments in reading and math for all students in grades 3 through 8. Assessments must be valid, reliable, and developed in a manner consistent with professional and technical standards. States must include multiple measures of student achievement. An itemized analysis of test results will be sent to school districts and schools to address the specific needs of students.

The new law provides \$2.3 billion over six years for States to support the development and implementation of new, high quality assessments. While new assessments are being developed, States will continue reading and math assessments in three grade spans as required by the Improving America's Schools

Act of 1994.

- **Holds schools accountable to a fair and rigorous standard for student progress and achievement.** States must define what constitutes “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) for schools and districts. State AYP targets must increase annually so that all students reach proficiency within a 12-year timeline. Within that 12 year period, States must raise their AYP targets at least every three years to ensure continued school improvement. Schools must measure their progress toward the heightened targets using annual assessment results. In order to ensure statistical reliability, schools may gauge their progress from year to year using assessment results averaged over three years. Under a new “safe haven” rule, in any given year a school may still reach its AYP goal if it: (1) makes at least 10% progress towards the goal of full proficiency within 12 years, and (2) shows improvement on additional assessments or performance indicators defined by the State.
- **Provides an infusion of increased resources to the neediest schools.** Title I funding will grow next year by nearly \$1.6 billion -- a 20% increase. Because of improved targeting provisions included in the No Child Left Behind Act, high poverty urban and rural areas will see the largest percentage gains. Every major city in the country will see a more than 30% increase in Title I funding -- \$11 million more for Boston, \$144 million more for New York, and \$80 million more for Los Angeles.
- **Holds low-performing schools accountable for results.** After two consecutive years of failing to meet AYP targets, the No Child Left Behind Act requires school districts to identify low-performing schools for improvement and provide technical assistance to those schools to help them develop and implement a plan for improvement.

If a school does not meet its AYP target for 2 consecutive years, the school must: (1) implement a two-year improvement plan that incorporates research-based reforms to improve student achievement, (2) dedicate 15% of Title I funds for professional development, and (3) provide public school choice with transportation for all students in the relevant school attendance area.

- **Provides extra help and tutoring for students in low-performing schools.** If a school continues to fail to meet its AYP target for 3 consecutive years, the school must continue to implement its plan for improvement and public school choice and make supplemental services available to the lowest performing students in the school.

If a school does not meet its AYP target for 4 consecutive years, the school must continue activities from previous years, and implement corrective actions, such as instituting a new curriculum or replacing some staff. If after 6 consecutive years, a school continues to fail to meet its AYP target, it must restructure by replacing all school staff or reopening as a magnet or charter school.

- **Provides parents with tools and information about student achievement.** Parents and the public will receive report cards on their State, school district, and school's comparative performance. Report cards will provide aggregate student achievement data, detail student achievement data by race and income group, compare school and district performance, and offer comparative information on teacher quality. Assessment reports for individual students will provide diagnostic information to parents and school officials to pinpoint academic strengths and weaknesses and inform school improvement efforts.

Title II: Teacher Quality

2001-2002 School Year: \$2.3 billion *nationally*

2002-2003 School Year: \$2.93 billion (\$630 million increase) *nationally*

The No Child Left Behind Act:

- **Requires all schools to dedicate 10% of Title I funds to professional development.** Current law requires only failing schools to dedicate 10% of their Title I funds for professional development. The No Child Left Behind Act requires all Title I schools to dedicate 10% of their Title I funds for professional development and failing schools to dedicate an additional 5% of Title I funds for professional development for a total of 15%.
- **Holds states accountable for ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified within 4 years.** States must submit plans to the Secretary to ensure that within 4 years every classroom is led by a highly qualified teacher. States must establish a strategy for annually increasing the percentage of teachers with access to high-quality professional development.

If a State does not meet its annual goals in these two areas for two consecutive years, districts that are behind must develop improvement plans to get them back on track towards such goals, and the State must provide those districts with technical assistance.

If a State does not meet its annual goals for 3 consecutive years, the State shall enter into an agreement with districts that have fallen behind to develop in

conjunction with teachers and principals research-based professional development strategies and activities necessary to meet annual goals. Districts falling short of teacher quality goals are prohibited from further hiring of para-professional teacher aides until they meet their teacher quality goals, unless the district demonstrates that a significant influx of students has substantially increased student enrollment or that there is an increased need for translators or assistance with parent involvement activities.

- **Defines “highly qualified teacher.”** In order to be considered highly qualified, a teacher must be certified and demonstrate competence in the knowledge, skills, and subject matter involved in their primary instructional field.
- **Defines “professional development.”** The new law ensures that professional development activities funded under the Act will improve teachers skills and content knowledge; are an integral part of broad schoolwide and districtwide improvement plans; are tied to state standards, assessments, and curriculum; are intensive, ongoing, and classroom-focused; are designed with the participation of teachers, principals, parents and administrators; and are not one-day or short-term workshops or conferences.
- **Defines “Teacher Mentoring.”** The No Child Left Behind Act ensures that teacher mentoring activities are research-based, provide on-going support for beginning teachers, and are designed to help beginning teachers continue to improve their skills and increase their content knowledge.

Title III: Bilingual and Immigrant Education Aid

2001-2002 School Year: \$446 million *nationally*

2002-2003 School Year: \$665 million (\$219 million increase) *nationally*

Established in 1968, the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) sets forth the federal role in providing educational assistance to LEP students. Since the BEA’s inception, the federal role has evolved to provide LEP students with instructional support and resources to master English and meet challenging academic standards in core subject areas. Currently, approximately 12% of the nation’s 4.1 million LEP children are being provided services tailored to their language needs under the Bilingual Education Act.

Under the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994, the Bilingual Education Act provided funding through competitive grants to local school districts for the development and implementation of bilingual education programs, while supporting activities and research aimed at furthering the field of teaching of limited English proficient students. The Bilingual Education Act also supported competitive grants aimed at training and

recruiting bilingual education teachers.

The Emergency Immigrant Education Act, also authorized under the Improving America's Schools Act, responds to the financial challenges faced by schools educating large numbers of new immigrant students. Close to one in four children with limited English proficiency are immigrant students, comprising nearly 5 percent of the nation's school-age population. Since its inception, the number of children served under the Emergency Immigrant Education program has more than doubled, and today equals nearly 1 million children and youth.

The No Child Left Behind Act continues support for proven, research-based bilingual education programs, providing additional funding and flexibility for local schools to choose the instructional programs and practices that best meet the needs of their limited English proficient students

The No Child Left Behind Act:

- **Creates a New, Formula-Based Program to Support Limited English Proficient Students in All States.** A new, formula-based program under Title III will support limited English proficient and immigrant children in learning English and achieving in core academic subjects. Under this program, federal dollars will support the development and implementation of bilingual education programs, along with a broad range of services for limited English proficient students. Funding will reach a greater number of school districts by consolidating existing services under the Bilingual Education Act and the Emergency Immigrant Education Act.
- **Targets Services to Immigrant Children and Youth.** The No Child Left Behind Act continues to provide tutoring, mentoring, counseling, and other support for immigrant students throughout the States. Funding that targets immigrant children and youth will be distributed in each State through a set-aside of up to 15 percent.
- **Expands Parental Notification for Services.** The No Child Left Behind Act requires all parents to be notified of their students designation as limited English proficient, and their options for program services to serve their child. Parents will have the option to decline enrollment of their child in programs or services if they so choose.
- **Maintains Focus on Research and Teacher Training.** Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act will continue current grants focused on professional development for bilingual teachers and personnel, and will support a national program to award

new grants to school districts working with colleges and universities to train and develop qualified and certified teachers to work with limited English proficient students. The No Child Left Behind Act maintains a national clearinghouse at the federal level to disseminate research and provide assistance in addressing the needs of limited English proficient students.

Title IV: After-School Learning Opportunities

2001-2002 School Year: \$846 million *nationally*

2002-2003 School Year: \$1 billion (\$154 million increase) *nationally*

Begun in 1994 as a \$50 million pilot project, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program now provides grants to support the planning and implementation of after-school programs directed toward the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of inner-city youth and rural youth.

The No Child Left Behind Act:

- **Guarantees that districts in every State will receive after-school funding.** After-school funding was previously distributed through a federal-to-local level competitive grant process. Funding is now channeled through a federal-to-state formula. Funds are targeted to States based on child poverty.
- **Expands the types of entities eligible to receive after-school funding.** Within states, state departments of education will award after-school funds in the form of competitive grants to local programs. The types of entities eligible to apply for an 21st Century after-school grant have been expanded to include not only local school districts, but also community-based organizations, local governments, and other public and private entities. States must give priority to applications submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations.
- **Strengthens the focus of the program to support the academic enrichment of students.** Activities previously supported under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program were not required to be tied to the academic achievement of students. Now, eligible entities must carry out activities that are based on objectives that promote academic enrichment. After-school educational activities must be based on scientific research that indicates they will help students meet State academic standards.